

# Re: Owen's Two-Phase Model of Earth Expansion

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2005-03/0648.html>

---

**From:** Matt ([matt.edwards\\_at\\_utoronto.ca](mailto:matt.edwards_at_utoronto.ca))

**Date:** 03/04/05

Date: 4 Mar 2005 07:37:37 -0800

"Carsten Troelsgaard" <[carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk](mailto:carsten.troelsgaard@mail.dk)> wrote in message news:<4226f403\$0\$191\$edfadb0f@dread11.news.tele.dk>...

> *I believe one of the EE's favoured points is, that the marine sediments on the crust is the EE evidence that earth indeed was different then (continents had the ocean on top, not next to it). A thorough oceanic earth does, by and large, not erode and deposit at all; compared to the present situation. It obviously did, but I hardly dare consider the relief and the gradients, a rugged earth for sure.*

Not quite following you here. In EE we would say that in the initial phases the Earth's crust was entirely continental (sial) crust. It was more water-covered than today's crust, but gradually emerged over time (especially in slow EE). Erosion could have taken place once enough basins were present for sediments to be deposited in.

> *What do they gain by such a construction? Continental rocks, sima, wouldn't it basically have been placed and composed 'as is' and express a factual decompression of heavier rock at an earlier period and thus loose the observed incentive for the earth to expand by evolving lighter rocks? It's often been pointed out, that the 'lighter rock evolved' is not continental as it preferentially places itself as a heavy oceanic rock.*

You're saying that lighter 'continental' rocks tend to form or be deposited on older rocks, which then become denser rocks. But ocean crust is formed in situ as more dense rock than the sial rock. This process is ongoing. Now some continental rocks are added volcanically, but in general the EE picture of lighter continental blocks being uplifted by newly formed rocks of heavier density is quite simple, even elementary. You might find the paper by Weijermars interesting.

> *I squinted at the online presentation of Owen's model of expansion. He places plasma in the core with a reference to physicists for details. I did then look for Owen's own credentials since he respects professionalism, but he did not present himself. I have some preconceived notions and no real knowledge on plasma, but wouldn't it's eledged presence (however unlikely)*

sci.geo.geology: Re: Owen's Two-Phase Model of Earth Expansion

- > *be a result of compression and heat rather than a course for the uppersit?*
- > *Is there any scientific rationale for plasma to aggregate in space as a*
- > *precursor for planets?*
- >
- > *Carsten*

Where did you find Owen's work online? In his papers he is listed as being at the British Museum of Natural History. Is that credentials enough for you? In any case, I don't find the plasma core idea that compelling.

Matt